

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Curtis Q. Owens, # 184674,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No.: 0:09-1773-TLW-PJG
	)	
Tim Riley, TRCI Warden; Gary Lane,	)	
Assoc Warden; James Bates, "SMU" Lt;	)	
Jerry Alexander, Cap SMU; Henery	)	
McMasters, Attny Gen; Paul Brewton,	)	
Maj & SLED Agent; Jon Ozmint,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

The plaintiff, Curtis Q. Owens ("plaintiff"), proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. #1). On December 30, 2009, the defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #52). The plaintiff filed a response in opposition to the motion for summary judgment on January 13, 2010. (Doc. #60). The defendants filed a reply to the response on January 22, 2010. (Doc. #62). This case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 (B)(2), DSC.

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation ("the Report") filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. #89). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court grant the defendants' motion for summary judgment, and that the District Court dismiss the plaintiff's additional pending motions. (Doc. #89). The plaintiff filed objections to the report. (Doc. #91). In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections...The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections. After careful review of the Report and objections thereto, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Report. (Doc. #89). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the defendants' motion for summary judgment, (Doc. #52), is hereby **GRANTED**, and the plaintiff's additional pending motions, (Docs. #30, #74) are hereby **DISMISSED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

August 19, 2010  
Florence, South Carolina